

whose older father or mother is in agony, the chance to try medical marijuana. No, no. What we are going to do if somebody does that is seize their property. We are going to seize the property of the person that sold them the marijuana to alleviate their suffering.

This is contrary to everything our Founding Fathers had in mind. This is contrary to the ideal of American freedom and respect for individual rights.

I was one of Ronald Reagan's speech writers, as everyone knows, and I have been a Republican all my life, and here I am with my fellow Republicans, and we talk about getting the government off our backs. We talk about states' rights. We talk about individual responsibility all the time. And we talked lately about the doctor-patient relationship as being so important to us.

And then we turn around and a majority of my colleagues on the Republican side vote to have the Federal Government come in and step all over state's rights, step all over the rights of the individual to control his life and consume for himself, make his own determinations.

Individual freedom, limited government—these are things that we supposedly believe in, but when it comes to the drug issue, no, no; we think the Federal Government has to come in and make that determination for people in their own lives.

This is a threat to our freedom. My legislation will take a long step forward to making this a public issue. We should be debating this.

I have been sponsoring legislation. My first legislation that was successful was last term in Congress, the one that these arrogant prosecutors are ignoring now that has actually been put into law that they can't use their own resources, meaning their pay, their time, and their office in order to prosecute medical marijuana, but yet several of them are doing exactly that. That shows you how the law and how our constitutional rights are being threatened.

I didn't know what reaction my friends who are more conservative would have. I did not know that. I didn't know that maybe some of them would just say: Well, that is a lot of baloney, and just go on using the clichés about the states' rights and individual freedom and not really confront my argument. That is what I thought most of them would do.

But I asked a conservative friend of mine just to see what he would say. He is a retired naval officer—a pilot—and he is a typical conservative voter in my district, or in our area in southern California.

I asked him: What is your reaction to the fact that the guy you supported these years is now the point person in legalizing medical marijuana? And this officer said to me: You know, you don't know me very well, do you?

I said: Well, I know you supported me. You are a retired military officer,

and you are now engaged in the aviation business. And he said: Yes, but what you don't know is I have three sons. The day after 9/11, they all enlisted.

I said: Yeah. And he said: Let me tell you what happened. Two of my sons came home whole. One son came home having seizure after seizure after seizure every day.

Think of that. Your child, your hero marches off to war, and there he is, and you can't control the situation. He is having seizures.

They took him to the veterans hospital, and the veterans hospital couldn't do anything to help him. And then one veterans doctor pulled him aside and said: Come and see me off campus. I have got to tell you something. He said: Here is a prescription for medical marijuana. That is what your son needs. I am not permitted to tell you that at the VA hospital.

They did it. And this supporter of mine said: My son hasn't had a seizure since. I saw him just a while ago, and he said: It has been 4 years, and my son is still not having seizures. How do I feel about you being the point man on legalizing medical marijuana? I want to give you a big hug.

Well, guess what? There are people whose parents are dying or their family, their children, are going through seizures. My child recently had a problem with leukemia. Why would I think that, if she was having a seizure and that would help stop it, that the Federal Government should step in and prevent that?

That is what we are doing. The American people need to wake up. My bill will take us a step in the right direction.

I am asking my colleagues to support H.R. 1940. Do it because we believe in freedom. Do it because we believe in the well-being of the American people, and we believe in the system that our Founding Fathers decided of ultimate individual responsibility and freedom. That is what we are deciding, as well as the issue of whether or not some poor suffering soul shall be prevented from getting something that might alleviate their suffering.

That is not the job of the Federal Government. We need to stand tall on this. My colleagues need to be honest and open with their own constituents, and they will find that they are more supportive than they think.

With that said, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LIPINSKI (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 27, 2015, at 8 p.m.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 172. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse" (Rept. 114-89). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1690. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the "Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse" (Rept. 114-90). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 1981. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide that an employee's 'regular rate' for purposes of calculating overtime compensation will not be affected by certain additional payments; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr.

DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HARPER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. DUFFY, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HIMES, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 1982. A bill to amend the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 to confirm that a customer's net equity claim is based on the customer's last statement and that certain recoveries are prohibited, to change how trustees are appointed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1983. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to ensure that the receipts and disbursements of the Social Security trust funds are not included in a unified Federal budget and to provide that Social Security contributions are used to protect Social Security solvency by mandating that Trust Fund monies cannot be diverted to create private accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.